DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 486 SO 014 338

AUTHOR Papo, Moshe
TITLE Educational Change and Its Effect on Culturally Disadvantaged Populations: A Case Study, Israel.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 29p.; Some pages may be marginally legible due to fading ink.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Case Studies; Comparative Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Principles; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Majority Attitudes; *Minority Groups; Postsecondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Israel

ABSTRACT

Educational change in Israel during the last 30 years is illustrated by comparing the status of Oriental and Ashkenazic (European) Jews. As opposed to the dominant Ashkenazic values of socialism, collectivism, and industrialism, the Oriental Jews in Israel value family, personalism, and traditionalism. As a result, the Israeli system tends to discourage the upward mobility (through educational attainment) of the Orientals. The problems have been recognized. From 1948 to 1958 formal equality characterized governmental policy in which a unified school system under the control of the state worked toward a unified culture. From 1958 to 1968 the policy of compensatory education sought to rectify mistakes inherent in the previous policy. Children of non-European origin were considered culturally disadvantaged and were enrolled in programs to bring them up to the level of the European Jews. By 1968 it was apparent that compensatory education was not closing the gap. From that time to the present educational reform has consisted of academic, vocational, and agricultural curricula. Although the reform has stressed the rich cultural heritage of the Orientals and has extended free tuition to the post-elementary level, the restructuring of the system has perpetuated the values of the dominant group, the Ashkenazi. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223486

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Moshe Papo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDUCATIONAL CHANGE AND ITS EFFECT ON CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS: A CASE STUDY, ISRAEL

Moshe Papo
University of Illinois

1981

SP 017 338

INTRODUCTION

Israel is a country which has been shaped by an in-gathering of exiles from many lands and many cultures. These exiles came from Europe, Asia, North America and South America. The first immigrants to arrive and settle the land were Europeans. Their culture was typically Western, characterized by a high level of progressivism, education and technology. Therefore, the foundations of the new State of Israel were patterned along "Western" or "European" traditions. With the influx of immigrants from Asia and North Africa, in the 60's, the country was flooded with new ethnic groups quite different from the founding fathers. These groups were primarily characterized by their agricultural or "country" origins; their centralization around the family core - where the father is all-knowing and has the last say in everything; and by their adherence to traditional Judaism.

This inclusion of two widely different ethnic groups within one state, raised the question as to the "true" national identity of the State of Israel.

> What are the values that must characterize the Israeli in a modern developing technological world which will permit him to hold on to the traditions, culture and religion of Judaism?... Do we need a technological society without consideration for ethnic differences? Should the overall culture of the State be a combination of the various sub-cultures in the society, given the danger that the culture might become levantine? Can there even really be a true integration between Western culture and other ethnic cultures? [1]

Pluralism claims to confront the individual with different values in order that he may select those he wants to embrace. This kind of pluralism is undesirable for several reasons. Cultural heterogenity will result in heterogeneous goals and directions within the society. The final result of such heterogenity of goals will be the eventual weakening of national strength. "Cultural heterogenity confronts the individual with too many possibilities. He becomes a constant searcher and questioner." [2] It doesn't provide him with the direction or guidance, which I feel, the State should provide in order to maintain a stable individual within a particular society.

A moderately pluralistic society seems necessary; one which includes several obligatory values shared by many. At the same time, the individual must be allowed to embrace any and all values that he wants to, providing they do not pose a threat to the general welfare of the society.

Naturally, the question is how to achieve such a concept of a moderately pluralistic society in practice. The generally accepted answer is through the school system. But, it would be naive to think that only educational activity through the schools will bring about changes in values and any significant integration.

Changes in the Israeli educational system, as in its social and political structure, have been extensive during the three short decades since the foundation of the modern State of Israel. As in most areas where extensive change is noted, social, cultural and political factors have combined to bring about changes and to obstruct them. Since Israel is an immigrant State, whose primary

aim has been the absorption of Jews from all over the world, the changes most greatly affecting the educational system have been social or socio-cultural variables. In the case of Israel, it is sometimes difficult to find direct links between social changes and specific structural changes in the educational system. Social input in the educational system is often obscured or confused by political and economic considerations. Often as not, only hypotheses may be drawn concerning the relationship between these, between social variables and educational changes.

One such hypothesis is presented by Yitzhak Kashti. [3] As stated the hypothesis supposes that in a pluralistic society, of which Israeli society is one, the dominant groups in the society will often join forces with the educational system in an effort to promote social equality. It is contended, however, that any such efforts will be self-obstructive. Changes being implemented by a dominant group will naturally reflect the social, cultural, political and even economic orientations of that group. Groups peripheral to the system, towards whom the changes are directed, are not usually participants in the decision-making process. They do not express their own orientations concerning the proposed changes and therefore true social equality is never achieved.

The purpose of this paper is to see whether or not the above hypothesis is correct in explaining the noticeable inequalities between various sub-groups in Israel today. In order to understand this hypothesis in the context of Israeli society, one must first understand the major views of intergroup relations and conflict presently held in this society.

There are in Israel today five major ethnic divisions in the population. They are: Palestinian Arabs vs. Israeli Jews; Israeli Arabs vs. Israeli Jews; Druze vs Christian vs. Moslem Arabs; religious Jews vs. non-religious Jews; and Oriental Jews vs. Ashkenazi Jews (Asian and North African Jews vs. European Jews). The first three divisions have become increasingly important since the Six-Day War. However, extensive research and materials are not available in these areas since sociologists have tended to focus on the latter two divisions. I have chosen to discuss in this paper the last division between Oriental and Ashkenazic Jews.

This was done for a number of practical reasons. First, the amount of material and research on the subject is quite extensive. Since the Magic Carpet immigration of Jews from Yemen in 1956 and the subsequent influx of Oriental Jews into the society since then, sociologists have been very interested in the absorption of these groups. Second, the Oriental population, due in large part to birth rates, now makes up the majority of Israeli society. However, they still represent a lower status level as compared with Europeans, who are the minority population. Finally, I have already had extensive work experience with the Oriental communities in the southern region of the country and intend to work in education in this region upon my return to Israel. I hope to draw upon this knowledge for the purposes of this paper.

After a brief discussion of Ashkenazi-Oriental relations, the first section of this paper will discuss the educational background and changes in the Israeli educational system. This will include a brief discussion of the various stages of development

which the Israeli system of education has undergone over the years. The second part of the paper will discuss why the changes instituted in the system failed or succeeded in closing the gap between ethnic groups in the society. In other words, does Kashti's hypothesis truly apply to the Israeli context?

ASHKENAZI-ORIENTAL RELATIONS

To the reader the exact nature of Ashkenazi-Oriental differences will probably be unclear. It is important to clarify some of the historical and social issues which separated these populations in the first place and which continue to separate them. A brief discussion of these factors follows, without which it is difficult to understand the conflicts which exist today.

In 70 A.D., with the fall of the Second Temple in Jerusalem, the Jews were dispersed. [4] Ethnic separation, later classified as Ashkenazi, Sephardi and Oriental, stem from this period of time. Although the dispersal created ethnic diversity, it also prevented ethnic tensions since each group remained distinct from the other with little or no contact between them. Each ethnic entity took turn in providing the leadership for World Jewry. Until the 11th century most of the Jews were Oriental, between the 11th and 15th centuries the Sephardi Jews were the predominant group and from the 16th century on dominance belonged to the Ashkenazi Jews.

Oriental Jews lived in the Middle East and North Africa, and later moved into Asia. Most of their history was spent under Islam which regards them as 'protected people'. While restricted in their social activities, they nonetheless enjoyed fairly cordial relations with their Arabic overlords. Their overall condition, however, deteriorated after the Arabic Renaissance until the 19th century with the Westernization of some of their mother countries. Life conditions varied somewhat from Arabic nation to Arabic nation, so that some groups were treated worse than others.

The Sephardi Jews lived primarily on the Iberian pennisula in Spain and Portugal. They were joined in the 8th century by a number of Oriental Jews who arrived before the Moorish takeover of the area. During the Dark Ages in Europe, Sephardi Jewry flourished culturally. With the Christian conquest of the area, however, the process of Europeanizing the Jews began. The 14th and 15th centuries saw the Inquisition which forced Sephardi Jews to "convert", to die or to be expelled from Spain. Those who left settled mostly in Turkey and the Balkans, although some went on to the Middle East and North Africa. Those who forcibly converted went to Europe and North America.

The Oriental and Sephardi Jews are often lumped together, as in this paper, under the heading of Orientals. They share similar religious traditions and were both exposed to political, cultural and economic stagnation followed by late introductions to modern ideas. They are both similar physically to non- Jewish populations of the Middle East. However, the Sephardi Jews spoke (to a lesser degree today) a dialect of Spanish and Hebrew known as Ladino. The Oriental Jews speak, and spoke, dialects of Judeo-Arabic or Judeo-Persian. Too, the period of cultural flourishing left the Sephardi Jews with a sense of elitism which is not found in the culture of Oriental Jews. Finally, both groups have strong feelings of religion and family, the latter being characterized by the notion that "Father knows best".

After the 16th century the Ashkenazi Jews were the predominant force. At first they were centered mainly in the German regions. Later the Eastern European Jews became the predominant center and

after the Holocaust this center shifted to the United States, Israel and Western Europe. The Ashkenazi Jews are likewise diversified culturally, but share many fundamentals. They are physically like Europeans. They spoke a German-Jewish dialect, with slight variance from country to country, called Yiddish. They have a common style of religious practice unlike that of the Sephardic and Oriental Jews.

The Ashkenazi differed strongly from the Oriental and Sephardi Jews in their culture, their philosophy and their literature. They tended to have very strong senses of culture, even more so than the Sephardi Jews. They strongly adopted European ideologies such as emancipation, assimilation, nationalism, liberalism and socialism. They brought these ideals, as did the Orientals, to their new homeland in Israel.

It was not until the 20th century that two groups, which I will call from now on Orientals and Ashkenazim, encountered one another closely. This came about with the rise of the Zionist movement and the establishment of the State of Israel. In the case of the former, the Oriental community was excluded. Zionsim was a European movement designed to alleviate the problem of European Jewry living under assimilatory and sometimes hostile conditions. Due to the limited contact between Ashkenazim and Orientals, and the widely-held view of Orientals as backward, the spread of the Zionist movement to Oriental countries was not considered advantageous. The result of this exclusion was that the feeling of superiority and separateness that the Ashkenazim felt towards the Orientals was continued by the Zionist movement into the new state of Israel. Those Orientals who had little contact with this message of

superiority before coming to the state were quickly initiated upon arrival in the country.

CHANGES IN THE ISRAELI EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

It is evident from the above section that the ideal of Israel as a melting pot for all Jews has not been fully realized. Since its inception the modern State of Israel has experienced sweeping changes in all facets of its make-up: political, social, economic and educational. Since educational changes are related in a particular way to broader changes in the society, I will first discuss briefly two major changes which have occurred in Israeli society.

The major contradiction today in Israeli society is "between a desire to maintain socialist ideals and a desire to acquire the fruits of capitalism." [5] Two important changes in the social structure of the country have given rise to this contradiction. The one is increased industrialization and urbanization; the other is a shift in the demographic make-up of the population.

Increased urbanization has been promoted by the State, without attempting to draw away from the agricultural needs of the State. This policy was prompted by an effort to reduce importations by encouraging domestic production. Still later, increased industrialization was encouraged for exportation, and the subsequent increase in the national economy. In any case this increased industrialization had several effects on the society. It brought about a shift in the population from rural areas into the small cities. It also brought about a shift away from the Zionist ideals on

which the State had been founded.[6] Increased competition took the place of egalitarianism. There was now intergroup competition for occupational status, economic status and the subsequent social status these provided.

The second major change was a shift in the demographics of the society. Since World War II, Ashkenazi birth rates have been on the decline. At the same time the percentage of infant mortality among the Orientals has been reduced, which has in effect doubled this population since that time. Beginning in the 50's and continuing heavily in the 60's, the influx of immigration into Israel has primarily been Oriental. Today this population represents between 60-70 percent of the total Israeli population.[7]

As has been said before, this population differs qualitatively from the Ashkenazi population which basically settled the country. They brought with them neither the intellectual inclinations towards socialism or collectivism, nor the history of strong capitalist ideals. They did bring with them deeply-rooted values, such as familism, personalism and traditionalism which contrasted sharply with the modern expanding and increasingly industrial nation into which they were thrown.

The changes that occurred in the State, as described above, are indirectly related to changes that were made in the educational system of the country. As in the United States, the educational system is one of the primary sources for the absorption of immigrants. However, there are striking differences in the ways that this is carried out in the two countries. In the United States the emphasis has been on equality of opportunity through schooling,

whereas the Israeli system, which is strongly modeled after the European system, views education as primarily a lifting up of the bottom. [8] The American system has tried to achieve this goal through a common school system which requires the lowering of the level of the system through high school. The Israeli system does not do this. The high school system is extremely difficult so that children lacking in motivation, family support, or who come from an underprivileged background are less likely to succeed in school. Thus the Israeli system tends to discourage the upwards mobility of the Orientals, at least in terms of their educational attainment.

These problems in the educational system have been recognized throughout the three decades of the State's existence. They have been dealt with in varying times throughout that time. Problems in education are always considered as one of the most pressing problems of the State, after physical survival, since there is a strong history of Jewish concern with the education of its young.

The Compulsory Education Act of 1949 provided for the free and compulsory education of all children, Jew and non-Jew, between the ages 5-13 and for adolescents between 14-17 who had not finished their elementary education. [9] Just recently, in 1978, the same arrangement of free tuition has been extended to the secondary school system. University tuitions are usually subsidized according to the parents' means. In addition, more scholarships are being made available to qualified Oriental Jews who wish to continue their education beyond the secondary school level.

There have been three major policies in the Israeli educational system which reflect changes in the general society. They are: [10]

From 1948-1958, the governmental policy was one of formal equality. This was based on the idea that different populations in the society should be treated equally in the educational system. Prior to independence the status of schooling had been one of separate but equal parts. Each group with a distinct sociological or ideological committment supported its own educational trends. These were abolished by the State Education Act of 1953 which established a unified system under the control of the State. Since the goal of the State was a unified culture, albeit a culture based on the orientations of the dominant Ashkenazi group, it could not afford to accentuate cultural differences between the populations. This policy became quickly unrealistic.

From 1958-1968 the policy was one of compensatory education. The great influx of Oriental immigration into the country during this period created a new demography in the classroom. By the middle 60's over half the population of children in the first grade were of non-European origin. [11] Large numbers of these children were unable to cope with the academic demands of the regular school program. As a result various additional instructional hours were given to these children to compensate for cognitive deprivation. Pupils in these programs were labelled as "culturally disadvantaged". This term emphasized the cultural differences between the Oriental populations and the Ashkenazi populations in a negative manner.

Pupils under these programs of compensation were given extended instruction in such areas as Hebrew and mathematics within the

framework of an extended school day. Nursery and kindergarten programs were instituted for 3 and 4 year olds as preparation for the regular preschool experience which began at 5. Remedial instruction was introduced in grades 2 through 5. Experiments were also conducted into the use of new materials and other enrichment programs not deemed necessary for the Ashkenazi student. Needless to say all of this experimentation did not result in a closing of the educational gaps, so that a committee was set up in 1965 to look into the problem of the ever-widening gap between the populations.

From 1968-present the policy has been one of educational reform. This followed the recommendations of the Praver Committee of 1965, which had been asked to look into extending the Compulsory Education Act to the 9th grade level in an effort to close the gap between Orientals and Ashkenazim. The final proposals submitted for parliamentary approval were:[12]

1. The existing structure of Israeli education can be replaced by a six-three-three pattern of organization.
2. The three-year "middle school" (grades seven, eight and nine) and the three "upper school" (grades ten, eleven and twelve) be joined in six-year regional comprehensive schools.
3. All students who complete six years of elementary school be guaranteed admission to the "middle school" and that graduates of the "middle school" be automatically admitted to the upper school.
4. The scope of free and compulsory education be extended to include the 14- to 15-year-old age group by 1972 and the 15- to 16-year-old age group by 1975.

SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF CHANGES TO CLOSE INTER-ETHNIC GAPS

Israel has been guilty, as have many nations, in naively believing in the power of education to reduce social inequality. This belief arose from the supposition that environment is the chief factor in cognitive and personality development and that socioeconomic status is primarily determined by one's competence. This in turn implies that school, being a part of one's social environment, can or should be central to the elimination of social inequalities. These basic assumptions underline the policy of the new State of Israel, particularly after the enactment of the State Education Act of 1953 which placed the educational system in the control of the government. The basic policy was one of equal distribution of cognitive skills to all pupils. This policy was in effect designed to ignore ethnic and cultural differences.

The notion of equal schooling for all was supported by the egalitarian ideals of the State during the critical first period of its life. Having suffered persecution in their own countries, the Ashkenazi founding fathers were determined that no form of persecution would be visible in their new homeland. Equal schooling for all was to mean equal socioeconomic mobility. Therefore "inferior" schools were to be improved to the new level of schooling that the Ashkenazi community demanded for its sons and daughters. They again naively believed that better facilities meant better achievement.

During this initial period of development (1948-1958) it was possible to maintain this outlook because the problem was not yet

of a magnitude to be recognized. Too, the government, while highly committed to education, was concerned with the survival, physical and political, of the fledgling State. Statistics in 1948, however, show that 75% of the pupils not promoted from elementary schools in the area of Tel-Aviv (one of the major towns of its time) were Orientals. [13]

Despite alarming statistics, such as the one above, the policy of formal equality in school continued until the late 50's and early 60's. The great influx of immigrants from Oriental backgrounds into the country at this time was the primary factor in re-evaluating the system. The greater number of pupils attending schools without either the history of education or the cognitive levels of their Ashkenazi counterparts, made it impossible to ignore ethnic, cultural or social differences. Success in school could no longer be argued on the basis of more exposure to equal schooling. Too, the immigrants suffered from economic and political disadvantages as well as educational disadvantages. Concentration on the equalizing of opportunity through schools at the expense of economic and political equality no longer made sense.

In the past two decades two alternatives have been proposed to solve the constant gaps in opportunities between the Orientals and Ashkenazim. The one has been compensatory procedures designed to give all pupils equal chances at achieving diplomas or certificates, which in turn give them equal chances in the competitive market. The other method was the introduction of a reform which provided different types of curricula, academic, vocational and

agricultural to suit the needs of different pupils. This too was based on the promise of successful completion for all pupils of their schooling, resulting in a certificate or diploma. In this case, however, the types of certificates or diplomas awarded to students differed with the type of curricula and automatically segregated students into different competitive markets.

Compensatory education, in the period from 1958-1968, made progress but not overwhelming progress. Compensatory strategies at this time meant starting schooling earlier, lengthening the school hours for those who needed it, and in simplifying the schooling requirements for students who could not keep up with the regular school level. This policy was maintained successfully because of the external pressures of war faced by the country during this ten year period. They were also maintained because some noticeable progress was made in helping children, classified as disadvantaged, to master the cognitive skills that set them behind advantaged students. Any progress in this area, however slight, was considered indicative of the success of the method.

At the end of the 8th grade which signified the end of elementary school, all pupils were given an achievement test called the seker (survey).[14] This was used from the period of time from 1955-1967. Not only was it used as a method of cognitive progress in the individual student, but it came to serve as a measure of the success of compensatory education. Measurements of the success of compensatory education had seemed to show that it was quite successful. This was a false presumption as was later proved by the sekers. It was due to a large extent in the measurement of relative and absolute

gaps in education. It was true that the relative gaps between Orientals and Ashkenazi had diminished. This was attributable to the fact that Orientals began at such a low level of education in comparison with equivalent Ashkenazi groups, so that improvement in cognitive gains was rapid. The absolute gap between the two groups remained. So while there was an initial reduction of inequality the overall pattern remained. Too, those who succeeded, from the Oriental group, tended to point out the failings of the ones who did not, by standing as statistical evidence for the success of the program. The program could not be faulted so blame must lie with the pupil.

Upon closer examination of the results of the seker, particularly towards the end of the period from 1958-1968, statistics did not bear out further progress beyond the initial one. The 1966 seker showed that 75% of the pupils of Western and European parentage received passing scores on the test. However, two-thirds of the Oriental population failed. These statistics were supported by others in the area of part- or full-time participation in post-elementary education, by attendance records and by enrollment in academic and vocational schools. [15]

A number of reasons can be given for the overall failure of the compensatory system used in 1958-1968. In essence, these programs did not change the basis on which education in the State was founded. The basic ideas of what type of education should be given to pupils derived from the ideals of the Ashkenazi group. They continued to enjoy political control of the State and thus controlled the Ministry of Education. It was this group which decided

which children needed to be in a compensatory program and which did not. They now viewed the Oriental community as being "culturally disadvantaged". The use of compensatory education was then to bring these "culturally disadvantaged" to the cultural, including educational, level of the "advataged culture"; i.e. the Ashkenazi or European/Western culture. In its favor, compensatory education now recognized cultural or ethnic differences which formal equality had tried to overlook. But they saw them as negative, as something that must be done away with entirely. This failure to accomodate to differences in ethnicity and to concentrate on the European/Western culture as the one right culture, was passed on to the teachers. For the most part, educational personnel received little or no special training for educating Oriental students whose backgrounds handicapped their educational success. Since most of the teachers were also of the Ashkenazi background, they had great trouble in understanding their pupils. They were unfamiliar with customs, attitudes and social interaction rules of these pupils. Their tendency was to ignore these and to drill European/Western culture at them.

Besides the fact that compensatory education did not change the basic curricula of the school and perpetuated cultural and/or ethnic differences, it also did not satisfy the need for integration that the government hoped it would. It was assumed that if these communities were given educational tools which permitted them to compete with their Ashkenazi counterparts in the society, then they would integrate into the Israeli social system. However, since

Oriental immigrants tended to live in "ghettos", pupils had little interaction with other pupils of European/Western background. They ha no way to relate to their teacher or to the materials which was culturally foreign to their surroundings. Not enough was done in the area of social activities which in turn would have influenced the self-image of the Orientals considerably.

Given the limited success of compensatory measures, such as those described above, the government turned to more extensive measures. Structural reform was instituted into the system in 1968 and like its predecessors, the Reforma as it was called, has had some success and some failure. The dominant feature of this new structural system is its differentiation, with its three trends of academic, vocational and agricultural streams. At one end of the scale are strictly academic-oriented schools, at the other end are strictly vocational and in the middle is the new creation, the comprehensive school which provides for all streams. The comprehensive school seems to be now merely a combination of the two trends, academic and vocational. It continues the academic orientation of schools by relying on cognitive achievement as the sole criteria for the particular stream a pupil is directed into. On the other hand, it retains the vocational orientations of schools by defining pupils for particular roles in the society at an early age on the basis of the stream they are placed into. The former seeks to give students a choice of values and norms to prepare him for a flexible status in the society while the latter adapts them to a sense of more rigid patterns of status and employment. In a sense, the comprehensive school gives out conflicting signals to the pupil concerning his relationship in

the society.

In effect, the restructuring of the system has perpetuated the value system of the dominant group, the Ashkenazi. Academic criteria is still the criteria by which pupil progress is evaluated. This is compounded by a labeling of students from an early age as to their capabilities in particular areas and a closing of the academic door for many of them. Equal opportunity becomes the ability of all pupils to achieve some occupational level through schooling. However, the elitism associated with academic success and the economic and social status which accompanies it, is even more pronounced in the present system. Those not belonging to the dominant Ashkenazi group are still limited in their mobility and in full participation in the society. These are the very factors which the restructuring had hoped to overcome or eliminate and yet they seem only to perpetuate the lack of full integration of Orientals into society.

In a sense, the Reforma, fails because it uses some of the ideas of the formal equality stage. It assumes that by mixing bodies from different backgrounds under one roof, that by a process of osmosis integration will occur. It is naive to think that by bringing people in contact with one another, social gaps can be overcome. To its credit the Reforma was instrumental in doing away with the idea that Orientals were "culturally deprived". Strong effort is made to emphasize the rich heritages of various Oriental groups. This is done primarily through informal activities outside the regular classroom learning time. Emphasis in history and literature is still primarily concerned with those events which affected European Jews, namely the Holocaust, and with European-Israeli authors, such as Bialik. Until

cultural aspects of the Oriental communities are incorporated into the formal reading material of all students, ethnic relations will never achieve full understanding between groups.

The Reforma also has some innovations to its credit. Unlike the previous compensatory programs, it calls for a retraining and training of teachers to meet the needs of the new structure. The relative success of these programs has been aided by an increase in the number of teachers of Oriental background which has risen during the last decade. However, this is complicated by a problem of the distribution of the Oriental communities. Many are located in rural development towns which perpetuates the monocultural nature of many schools. The relative distance of these towns from major urban centers has made it more difficult to attract highly qualified personnel. The government has tried to compensate by providing extensive compensations to those teachers who choose to teach in these areas. However, the turnover in teaching personnel remains high and the tendency has been to attract young inexperienced teachers straight from the army.

Another positive innovation of the Reforma was the extension of free tuition to the post-elementary level. This enabled Oriental parents to support extended schooling of their children which was also now required by law. [16] Formerly, parents saw their children as an added source of income, requiring their going out into the work field at an early age. This extension of free tuition is further aided at the college level where large subsidies and scholarship funds are provided for students who can not afford to pay the tuition.

SUMMARY

Although the recent educational changes provided by the Reforma seem to have initiated some important innovations in schooling, it is still too early to pass final judgement on their total success or failure to close interethnic educational gaps. The orientation in schooling continues to be that of the dominant Ashkenazi group. The Minister of Education is Ashkenazi, as are most of the officials in decision-making positions in the Ministry. The curriculum under the Reforma is varigated to meet the needs of different pupils but the content is still culturally biased in favor of the Ashkenazi group. By segregating pupils early into occupational streams, the system tends to perpetuate a base into which the Orientals can move only slightly up into the middle registers of the economy. While it no longer explicitly segregates them as "culturally deprived" it does segregate them into "economically disadvantaged" categories. Since the majority of Oriental students are placed into the vocational stream, the label is no longer "Oriental" but "technical" student or "vocational" student which carries the notion of disadvantage.

Kashti's hypothesis seems valid for the Israeli situation. All of the educational changes that were made in the period since statehood have reflected the values or orientations of the dominant Ashkenazi group. In the case of both the formal equality and compensatory education stages, this was seen to have failed. Politically and educationally, the group towards whom these changes are directed continue to remain outside of the decision-making process. While that may not be the ultimate solution to the

problem or inequality in education in Israel, it certainly contributes to it. However, one must always remember that educational gaps are not the only source of inequality in a pluralistic society such as Israel. Changes in the educational system need to be accompanied by changes in the social system, the economic system and the political system in order to accomplish a radical change in the inequality between groups.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Ronen, Hanan, "Education for Values in the Process of Ethnic Group Assimilation" in The Supervisor's Bulletin, Y. Niv (ed.), Volume 4, The Israeli Teacher's union Press, 1975, p. 43 (in Hebrew).

2. Ibid, p. 44

3. Kasnti, Yitzhak, "Stagnation and Change in Israeli Education", Comparative Education, Volume 14, No. 2, June 1978, p. 154.

4. The following historical information was taken from three sources. First from Israel: Social Structure and Change, Michael Curtis and Mordechai S. Chertoff, eds. Second from Israel: Pluralism and Conflict, S. Smooha. Finally, from personal knowledge through schooling.

5. Weller, Leonard, Sociology in Israel, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1974, p. 10.

6. Zionism originated in the late 1880's in Eastern and Central Europe. It represented a rebellion against traditional views of Jews and Judaism. It negated the assumption that a full Jewish life and tradition could be maintained in an alien modern society. As such its manifestation was in nationalism and emigration to Israel.

7. Patai, Raphael, "Western and Oriental Culture in Israel", in Israel: Social Structure and Change, Michael Curtis and Mordechai S. Chertoff, eds., New Brunswick, N.J., Transaction Books, p. 309.

8. While, the American system of education is assumed to be based on equal opportunity for all to pursue an education, the Israeli system, with its strong socialist base, assumes that through education all will be equipped to obtain an equal status in life. The American system does not try to equalize the differences between pupils but affords them the opportunity to do so. In addition, the Israeli system of education is selective and the American elective.

9. Facts About Israel: Education, Israel Information Center, Jerusalem, p. 2. This is an information published by the government.

11. Smooha, S. Israel: Pluralism and Conflict, Los Angeles, University

11. of California Press, 1978, p. 160.

10. Facts About Israel: Education

12. Ackerman, Walter, "'Reforming' Israeli Education", in Israel: Social Structure and Change, pp. 401-2.

13. Facts About Israel: Education.

14. The seker was a highly selective measure of achievement and as such was culturally biased. It served to decide who could go on to secondary education, although it was not the only deciding factor. Because of these two drawbacks it was discarded as a measure when the Reforma was instituted.

15. Ackerman, Walter, op. cit., p. 400.

16. Facts About Israel: Education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, W., "Reforming Israeli Education", in Israel: Social Structure and Change, Michael Curtis and Mordechai S. Chertoff, eds., New Brunswick, N.J., E.P. Dutton and Co., 1973, pp. 397-408.

Adler, Chaim, et al, The Education of the Disadvantaged in Israel: Comparisons, Analysis and Proposed Research, New York, N.Y., National Council of Jewish Women, 1975.

Eisenstadt, S.N., Israeli Society, New York, N.Y., Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Facts About Israel: Education, Israel Information Center, Jerusalem, 1981, (Government Publication).

Heller, C., "The Emerging Consciousness of the Etnic Problem Among the Jews of Israel", in Israel: Social Structure and Change, pp. 313-32.

Kashti, Y., "Stagnation and Change in Israeli Education", Comparative Education, Volume 14, No. 2, June 1978, pp. 151-61.

Lissak, M., "Pluralism in Israeli Society", in Israel: Social Structure and Change, pp. 363-78.

Patai, R., "Western and Oriental Culture in Israel", in Israel: Social Structure and Change, pp. 307-12.

Pelled, E., "Education: The Social Challenge", in Israel: Social Structure and Change, pp. 389-96.

Pelled, E., "The Case of Israel", in Government in the Classroom, Mary Frase Williams, ed., New York, N.Y., The Academy of Political Science, 1978, pp. 146-56.

Ronen, H., "Education for Values in the Process of Etnic Group Assimilation" in The Supervisor's Bulletin, Y. Niv, ed., Vol. 4, The Israeli Teacher's Union Press, 1975, pp 43-52.

Bibliography Continued

Rubin, M., The Walls of Acre: Intergroup Relations and Urban Development in Israel, New York, N.Y., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

Smooha, S., Israel: Pluralism and Conflict, Los Angeles, CA, University of California Press, 1978.

Smilansky, M., and Nevo, D., The Gifted Disadvantaged, New York, N.Y., Gordon and Breach, 1979.

Weingrod, A., Israel: Group Relations in a New Society, New York, N.Y., Praeger, 1963.

Weller, L., Sociology in Israel, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1974.